

Moderation Feedback - Central

Assessment Panel:

Physical Education

Qualification area

**Subject(s) and Level(s)
included in this report**

**Physical Education — Advanced Higher,
Higher, Intermediate 2 and
Intermediate 1**

Central Moderation

General comments on central moderation activity

As the Investigation unit is being withdrawn next session, a decision was made to focus all central moderation activity on the Analysis of Performance Unit.

Out of the 49 centres selected for moderation 35 were accepted and 14 were not accepted. The not accepted total was disappointingly high. All the not accepted centres chose to follow the advice given by Moderators, and carried out remediation work with their candidates and submitted the work again for an assessment review. All were successful following the review.

Although some of the work seen was of a good standard at each of the presentation levels, the majority was at or around the minimum competency level of Unit achieved. In two instances the work presented at Intermediate 2 level showed competency above this level and the centres were advised to either consider a change of presentation level for the candidates involved this year or to use this information for staff guidance in future years.

The venue and facilities for central moderation this year were first class. This was matched by the level of support provided by SQA staff at stages of the event. Moderators felt that having the facility to word process all reports was a major step forward. Moderators felt that being able to compose and edit the report on screen improved both the quality and presentation of the feedback they were able to provide.

Specific issues identified

Analysis of Performance

Most of the centres moderated included evidence from the NAB assignment. Some centres also included the summary pro formas from the NAB, with a record of the member of staff's judgement of the candidate's competency.

Much of the NAB evidence however had no, or only very brief comments from staff to indicate their view of the work, or to provide feedback to students. Sometimes a mark was awarded to each section of an answer but often no indication of what this meant was given. These situations made the moderation process difficult, leaving Moderators to basically assess the material from scratch and judge whether it met the required levels of competency.

Some centres supplemented their evidence from the NAB with evidence from a prelim paper. A small number submitted prelim evidence only. The details of the questions asked in prelims and relevant marking schemes were sometimes not included. In some instances although the prelim paper, and mark scheme were included along with the candidates responses, there was no reference to where Unit outcomes and criteria had been addressed in the questions or achieved in the responses.

At Higher and Intermediate 2 most candidates had collected relevant, general and focussed level data when addressing Outcome 1. Most were also able to explain the validity of the data gathered and why the methods used for recording the data were appropriate.

It was in the evidence submitted in response to the NAB questions of Outcome 2 that minimum competency work was often to be found. Here candidates tended to show only a

limited understanding of relevant concepts from the selected area of analysis and the relevance of this information to the individual's performance development was often not well explained.

At the time of submitting materials for moderation a number of centres were not able to submit evidence of the assessment of Outcome 3 and had not requested permission to submit incomplete evidence. Despite this fact they had completed the MS00 form indicating that candidates had achieved awards. This led to a not accept decision having to be made on seven centres.

When Outcome 3 was completed, in most cases satisfactory courses of actions to improve performance were outlined and students understanding of suitable methods of evaluating work undertaken was generally sound.

Overall though most candidates' work was close to the minimum competency of their presentation level. This was particularly so at Higher level where Moderators frequently wrote in accepted reports that the work of many of the candidates was at 'bare minimum competency level'. Examples where students demonstrated the headroom that would suggest the possible achievement of the B or A band course award, descriptions were rare. Staff judgements though, when indicated by comments made or grades or marks awarded, often seemed to be valuing the work at much higher levels.

There were several instances where a significant number of candidates were recorded on the MS00 form as having failed the Unit at the level of entry. There was no suggestion that these candidates had been offered a resit opportunity or that the work had or was being considered at the level below. In general the centres intentions were unclear. Where this was felt to be a possibility, Moderators mentioned both these options to the centre in their report. Is it possible for centres to change the results stated on MS00 when they submit the Unit result form and reinstate candidates previously recorded as having failed? If so, what form of check is applied in this circumstance?

On receiving a not accepted result a number of the centres contacted the Senior Moderator directly to seek advice about how the situation could be resolved. Although most generally accepted the Outcome in a professional way a frequent complaint was the timing of the moderation result coming only a few days before students are released for study leave. They felt that time constrains limited their options in addressing issues and created a stressful situation which could be avoided with an earlier warning.

The Moderators in the Physical Education team generally have some sympathy with this view. They feel that a broader approach operating through a year round programme of postal, visiting and central moderation of complete and incomplete evidence, might serve better purposes in terms of both quality assurance and support for centres.

Feedback to centres

Generally the standard of candidate performance was good.

However, centres should:

- ◆ ensure that NABs are followed carefully and all pages required for assessment are included. In the submission of Analysis of Performance assignments, can centres ensure that the data which students have gathered and discussed as part of this assessment is included.
- ◆ if a centre wishes to change any of the questions used in the Analysis NAB then care must be taken to ensure that the revised version still addresses the specific detail of the Outcome, and Performance Criteria. SQA recommends to centres that they submit any revision of NAB questions for a prior moderation before it is used with a candidate group.
- ◆ much of the NAB evidence had no or only very brief comments from staff to indicate their view of the work to provide feedback for students. Staff comments, either on or at the end of the work or in the form of a completed pro forma, should indicate the member of staff's judgement of the level of competency displayed by the student. This information is important to Moderators and will influence their decision about a centre's ability to judge candidate evidence.
- ◆ if submitting prelim question and answer material as evidence of competence, centres should ensure that the questions and an appropriate marking scheme are included. They must also ensure that the questions asked allow candidates to demonstrate the competencies outlined in the Outcomes and Performance Criteria and that the evidence is cross-referenced against individual Performance Criteria and outcomes.
- ◆ centres should ensure that the quality of work produced by candidates to demonstrate competency in the Performance Criteria of Outcome 2, matches the demands of the standards illustrated in Unit exemplar materials. Much of the evidence seen by Moderators, particularly at Higher level, was at minimum competency or below. At all levels though, candidates tended to show only a limited understanding of the relevant concepts of the selected area of analysis. In many cases the relevance of this information to the individual's performance development was not clearly understood or well explained.